THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS ROBERT M. SMITH WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS HARDIN CRAIG WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON

Vol. XVIII OCTOBER, 1943 No. 4

CONTENTS

PAGE

The *Sir Thomas Moore* Problem Reconsidered ..... *Paul Deutschberger* 156

Satire Concerning the Ale and Wine Trades ..... *Burton Milligan* 147

Jaques' Seven Ages ..... *Josephine W. Bennett* 168

Shakspere's Heroic Shrew ..... *Raymond A. Houk* 175

Polonius's Advice to Laertes ..... *N. B. Allen* 187

Editorial Comment—Was Shakspere a Botcher? ..... *S.A.T.* 191

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 601 West 113th Street, New York.

Subscription rate, $2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, fifty cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary

Copyright, 1943, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/shakespeare-association-bulletin_1943-10_18_4

SATIRE CONCERNING THE ALE AND WINE TRADES IN THE SHAKSPERIAN PERIOD AND LATER

By Burton Milligan

LITERATURE, particularly the popular literature, of the Tudor and Stuart period contains much satire directed at fradulent dealing in the ale and wine trades. The purpose of this article is to present some of the conventional satirical charges against brewers, vintners, and ale-sellers and some of the historical evidence bearing upon these charges. The information here presented should be of some value in appraising the degree of conventionality of the references to the ale and wine trades made by Shakspere and other dramatists of the period.

Against the brewers of ale and beer, two main charges were brought: that they watered their brew, and that they used various undesirable or inferior ingredients instead of good hops and malt.

It was the conviction of the satirists that almost all beer was watered until it was intolerably "small." The brewer, indeed, was pictured as growing rich by merely transferring Thames water into his vats and thence, scarcely altered, into his casks and barrels. Condemning this roguery, Nashe, in *Pierce Penilesse* (1592), asserted that the brewers, "by retayling filthy Thames water, come in a few years to be worth fortie or fiftie thousand pound."[1] Greene made the same charge, in *A Quippe for an Upstart Courtier* (1592):

> And you masse Brewer, that growe to be worth forty thousand pounds by your selling of soden water, what subtilty have you in making your beare, to spare malt & put in the more of the hop, to make your srinke (be barley never so cheap) not a whit the stronger, & yet never sel a whit the more measure for mony.[2]

Rowlands' *Greenes Ghost Haunting Conicatchers* (1602) pictured "the Thames most pitifully complaining, what monstrous havocke the Brewers made of her water, without all remorse or compassion."[3] The joke concerning watered beer and ale was popular enough, and presumably apt enough, to be taken up by ballad writer, epigrammatist,

and playwright. In the broadside ballad "A Mad Crew: or That Shall be Tried" (*c.* 1620), the following typical reference is found:

> Great store of good liquour the Thames doth contain,
> Whereof the old Maltman doth greatly complaine,
> That in the hot Kettle, the Mault will not bide,
> Well, quoth the brewer, now that shall be tryde.[4]

In Epigram Number 164 of *Upon English Proverbs* (*c.* 1611), John Davies wrote:

> 'To cast water in Thames is superfluous';
> Not at an ebbe when brewers it use.[5]

In Dekker's *The Shoemaker's Holiday* (1600), Firk speaks of "the Pissing-Conduit [that] leaks nothing but pure Mother Bunch."[6]

All sorts of undesirable ingredients and adulterants were placed in beer and ale, according to the testimony of the satirists. Indeed, some of the brewing processes that are described are hardly more appetizing than those employed by Elinour Rumming! Gascoigne's *The Steel Glass* (1576) made the general charge that brewers put "bagage in their beere."[7] Rowlands' *Greenes Ghost Haunting Conicatchers* tells of the

> abuse committed by such as sell bottle ale, who to make it fly up to the top of the house at the first opening, do put gunpowder into the bottles while the ale is new. Then by stopping it close, make the people believe it is the strength of the ale, when being truly sifted, it is nothing indeed but the strength of the gunpowder that makes the effect, to the great heartburning of the parties that drinks the same.[8]

Sometimes brewers put "willow leaves and broom buds into their woort in steed of hoppes"; sometimes lime was added to beer "to make it mightie."[9] William Harrison tells us that alewives mixed salt and "rosen" with ale, the former to make drinkers thirsty and the latter to color the ale.[10] If gunpowder, willow leaves, broom buds, salt, resin, and lime were frequent ingredients of beer and ale, one cannot wonder that many protests were voiced. The writer of one of the broadside ballads, "A True Character of Sundry Trades and Callings," summed up the views of the satirists when he wrote:

A Woman without e'er a fault
she like a bright Star will appear,
And a Brewer without any mault
will make but pitiful Beer.[11]

Many of the charges concerning the bad ingredients used in brewing are substantiated by historical evidence. In 1545 the Privy Council issued a warning to certain makers of malt, who "for their pryvate lucre with the contentacion of the buyers deliver forolt [stale] malt, and give v for iiij in their measure. . . ."[12] The profit derived from this chicanery by both the malt dealers and the brewers is obvious. A letter directed by the Privy Council to the Lord Mayor of London, in 1579, charges that brewers did not lower the prices of beer, or increase the quality of it, when the price of its ingredients decreased: "notwithstanding the plentie and cheapnes of malt, the beerebrewers and others did usuallie sell and retaile their beere in like sorte as they did when malt was sold at the double price it now is."[13] The Lord Mayor was required to reform the abuse. A similar complaint was made by the Privy Council in 1598. The brewers, said the complaint, "verie much overcharged" for their beer "notwithstanding that the price of mault is verie much abated."[14] In 1596 the Council urged the Lord Mayor of London and the Justices of the Peace for the counties of Middlesex and Surrey to examine brewers in and about London. The Council reported that

> some of those that have bene before us are chardged to have brewed and sold beere and ale at very excessive and highe pryces, as at xv^{en} and xvj^{s}, the barrel, somme of which wee have commytted to pryson and taken order that the rest shalbe bounde to answere this theire contempt the next Terme before us at the Starr Chamber.[15]

In 1597, Abraham Campion, "beerebrewer," was accused of having "solde and delivered certaine corrupt and unsavorie beere to the quantitie of thirtie two tonnes for the provision of her Majestys Navie in the late Voyadge unto Spayne."[16] Perhaps the most detailed testimony, and testimony strongly corroborative of practically every charge made by the satirists, was given by John Stow:

> Besides this Want of Measure, there were, about this Time, divers other Things charged upon the Brewers; which I will here set down, together with their Apology and Vindication of themselves; they were charged for their Malt and Hops which they used; as that they

> brewed with ill Malt, and in the End of the year they commonly brewed with Weavel Malt, being the Bottom and Sweepings of their Garners, to make Room to bring in new Corn. It was also reported, that they put in Darnel, Rosin, Lime, and Chalk, and such-like; which making the Drinkers thirsty, they might drink the more; and that, for Cheapness, when Hops were dear, they put into their Drink Broom, Bay-berries, Ivy-berries, and such like Things.[17]

Rogueries attributed to vintners were the following: mixing bad wine with good, adding lime to sack, watering wine, and giving short measure. The vintner, said Greene, mixed red wine with claret, small rochek with strong gascoigne, and sack with white wine.[18] Dekker described vintners at work after candlelight jumbling together French and Spanish wines.[19] Joseph Hall, in *Virgidemiarum* (1597), contrasting the golden age with his own times, wrote:

> Was then no playning of the Brewers scape,
> Nor greedie Vintner mixt the stained grape.[20]

The author of *The Penniless Parliament* (1608) said that "it is thought good, that it shall be lawful for muscadines, in vintners' cellars, to indict their masters of commixtion."[21] In *I Henry IV,* Falstaff complains:

> You rogue, here's lime in this sack too: there is nothing but roguery to be found in villanous man: yet a coward is worse than a cup of sack with lime in it, a villanous coward![22]

The watering of wine appears to have been fairly common. Gascoigne accuses vintners of this trickery and predicts that the millennium will arrive "When vintners mix no water with their wine."[23] A similar reform of the vintners is ironically described in the broadside ballad "News Good and New Too Good to be True" (*c.* 1625):

> No Vintner there [in London] doth mingle
> his wine with water pure:
> And then doth sweare 'tis neatest:
> in London's no such Brewer.[24]

Typical of the charge that vintners gave short measure is Epigram Number 99 in John Davies' *Upon English Proverbs* (*c.* 1611):

> 'The Vintner feares false measure'; How can hee
> Fear that he hopes his maintenance shall bee?[25]

"If wine were as necessary as Bread," wrote Samuel Butler in his character "A Vintner" (*c.* 1667), "he would stand in the Pillory for selling false Measure, as well as the Bakers do for false Weight."[26] In connection with the accusations

concerning short measures, it is significant that earlier in the century several turners—that is, makers of wooden measures—had taken an oath that "in future they will not make any other measures than gallons, potelle, and quarts; and that they will make no false measures. . . ."[27]

The tricks of tapsters and alewives to defraud the public were varied and ingenious, and some of them have modern parallels. The sellers of ale and beer gave short measure, by "frothing," "nicking," and other tricks; they overcharged and reckoned falsely; they sold adulterated drinks.

"Frothing" was probably the simplest means of giving short measure and certainly the most common, just as it is today. A glass or a can a third or half filled with foam represented a cheat to the customer but a profit to the tavern or alehouse. "Froth your cans well in the filling . . . and job your bottles o' the buttock, sirrah,"[28] was the instruction given by Ursula, in Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair* (1614), to Mooncalf, the tapster at her stand. The accusation of frothing was so common, the joke so familiar, that in some plays—for instance, Shakspere's *Measure for Measure* and Massinger's *A New Way to Pay Old Debts*—the Tapsters were named Froth. Writers of broadside ballads referred frequently to tapsters' practice of frothing. One of them wrote:

> When tapsters will not thrive by froth,
> And to score two for one are loth,
> And all old scores are paid in haste,
> Why then, I think, the worst is past.[29]

Another, referring to the tapster, said:

> But the chiefest fault in him we finde,
> he doth fill his cans with froth.[30]

Still another writer bewailed the fact that

> The Tapster [was] still living
> by foame and by froth.[31]

Other references of like tenor are numerous, both in broadside ballads and in other forms of literature.[32]

Another form of cheating was that known as "nicking." This term is somewhat confusing, for it was used by writers of the time to refer to two distinctly different rogueries: (1) keeping false reckonings on the notched sticks used for tallies, and (2) using beer cans, jugs, or glasses that were

short in measure because of false bottoms, indentations, or other deliberately contrived imperfections. That the confusion arising from these two meanings is not great is due to the fact that in most references "nicking" is clearly used in the second sense. The following lines from George Wither's *The Scourge* (1617) make what I consider to be the general distinction of the writers between "nicking," in the sense of using short measures, and "misreckoning":

> His [the tapster's] best revenue is by Nicke and Froth;
> Which priviledge to loose, they would be loth.
> And there's an old shift (if they leave it not)
> There must be something added to the shot.[33]

The short-measure cans, pots, and jugs of the tapster were the target of much invective. Rowlands complained, in *Greenes Ghost Haunting Conicatchers* (1602), of the tapsters' "fubbing off" their customers with "those slender wasted blacke pots and Cannes, that will hold little more than a Sering."[34] John Taylor, in *The Great Eater of Kent* (1630), wrote of the tapsters' "curtoll Cannes, tragicall blacke-pots, and double-dealing bombasted Jugges.[35] The broadside "Nick and Froth; or The Good-fellow's Complaint for Want of Full Measure" (*c.* 1665) complains of "counterfeit" beer flagons:

> For those that drink Beer, 'tis true as I'm here
> Your counterfeit flaggons you have,
> Which holds not a quart, scarce by a third part,
> And that makes my Hostis go brave.[36]

The same ballad makes melancholy comment concerning the general practice of nicking and frothing, and its effect upon convivial patrons:

> Scarce one house in twenty, where measure is plenty,
> But still they are all for the Pinch;
> Thus every day, they drive custom away,
> And force us good fellows to flinch.[37]

John Stephens' character "A Tapster" (1615) remarks cynically on short measures:

> He attributes the scant measure of his Jugge to the Cellars darknesse, and his saving nature; but rather then he will justifie both, he hath a certaine slight of hand to fill the first glasse, and so avoyds inquisition.[38]

In "Robin Conscience," a late seventeenth-century broadside, the hostess at an alehouse brags:

> Instead of a quart pot of pewter,
> I fill small jugs, and need no tutor.[39]

Tapsters' misreckonings of scores were frequently satirized. A typical reference is the following in one of the ballads:

> Your Tapster is growne a right honest man,
> For he will misreckon no more than he can.[40]

"Drink with all companies, though you be sure to be drunk," is the advice of Ursula to Mooncalf, the tapster, in Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair;* you'll misreckon the better, and be less ashamed on't."[41] In Nabbes' *Tottenham Court* (1633) the Tapster overcharges Changelove. A quarrel ensues, and after Changelove pays the false reckoning, the Tapster admits, "I have ore-reckon'd one and twenty pence."[42] According to Head's *The English Rogue* (1665) it was the habit of tapsters to use "the crotched chalk to score up two flaggons for one."[43] In *Vinegar and Mustard* (1673), "a right reverend fat Hostess" rebukes her husband for honest reckoning:

> Thou art such an innocent fool, that thou seest thy guests pot-shaken, and have lost their memories, yet you must tell them their just reckoning without overplus.[44]

The tapsters' habit of selling adulterated beer or ale was satirized by various writers. The beer the tapsters sold was often a mixture, said Greene, of poor beer and good: "halfe smal and halfe stong."[45] Lime was sometimes added to beer to make it froth more, a roguery which the Hostess in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* requested Bardolph to execute.[46] Sometimes musty ale was sold, a trick referred to in Massinger's *A New Way to Pay Old Debts* (*c.* 1626) when Justice Greedy accuses Tapwell and Froth of selling ale of this sort.[47] Bung, the knavish tapster in *The London Chanticleers* (*c.* 1636), proposes to "put off the barrel of sour beer by and by" on a wedding party:[48] Head asserted that it was one of the tricks of tapsters to serve good beer when the company first came in and "drappings of the tap" when they were half drunk.[49] The popular reputation of the tapster is shown by a proverb current as early as the sixteenth century: "Tapsters and ostlers are not always the honestest men."[50]

In conclusion, one may emphasize the fact that the charges made by the satirists against brewers and vintners are rather thoroughly corroborated by historical evidence. In spite of

the fact that certain accusations and jests seem conventionalized, the evidence indicates that the satirists were attacking genuine and contemporary evils. As to the satire directed at tapsters, the weight of corroborative historical data is lacking, probably because their knaveries were too trivial to gain much attention from the authorities; but there seems good reason here, too, to conclude that the satirists were representing actual conditions with a high degree of accuracy.

University of Illinois.

[1]*Works of Thomas Nashe,* ed. R. B. McKerrow, 5 vols. (London, 1910), I, 173.
[2]*Life and Complete Works,* ed. Alexander B. Grosart, 15 vols. (London, 1881-1886), XI, 274.
[3]*Complete Works of Samuel Rowlands,* ed. E. W. Gosse and Sidney Herrtage, 3 vols. (Glasgow, 1880), I, 8.
[4]*Pepys Ballads,* ed. Hyder Rollins, 8 vols. (Harvard University Press, 1929-1931), I, 192.
[5]*Complete Works of John Davies of Hereford,* ed. Grosart, 2 vols. (Edinburgh University Press, 1878), II, 45.
[6]IV, iv.
[7]Works, ed. J. W. Cunliffe, 2 vols. (Cambridge University Press, 1910), II, 71.
[8]*Op. cit.*, I, 9.
[9]*Ibid.*, I, 8. "Woort," says *NED,* is an "infusion of malt or other grain which after fermentation becomes beer."
[10]*Description of England,* ed. F. J. Furnivall, New Shakspere Society, Series 6, I, 161.
[11]*Roxburghe Ballads,* ed. William Chappell and J. W. Ebsworth, 9 vols. (London, 1871), VII, 18.
[12]*Acts of the Privy Council of England,* ed. J. R. Dasent, 32 vols. (London, 1890-1907), I, 246.
[13]*Ibid.*, XI, 268.
[14]*Ibid.*, XXIX, 143.
[15]*Ibid.*, XXVI, 542.
[16]*Ibid.*, XXVIII, 249.
[17]*A Survey of the Cities of London and Westminster,* ed. John Strype, 2 vols. (London, 1754), II, 289.
[18]*Op. cit.*, XI, 278-9.
[19]*The Seven Deadly Sinnes of London,* ed. H.F.B. Brett-Smith (Oxford, 1922), pp. 32-33.
[20]*Complete Poems,* ed. Alexander B. Grosart (Manchester, 1879), p. 62.
[21]*Old Book Collector's Miscellany,* ed. C. Hindley, 3 vols. (London, 1871-3), II, 6.
[22]II, iv, 139-142.
[23]*Op. cit.*, II, 171.
[24]*A Pepysian Garland,* ed. Hyder Rollins (Cambridge University Press, 1922), p. 218. Cf. Tale XV, *Merie Tales of Skelton* (*c* 1566): "Howe the vinteners wife put water in Skelton's wine."
[25]*Op. cit.*, II, 43.
[26]*Characters and Passages from Note-Books,* ed. A. R. Waller (Cambridge University Press, 1908), p. 165.
[27]H. T. Riley, *Memorials of London and London Life* (London, 1868), p. 78.
[28]II, i.
[29]"The Worst is Past," *Roxburghe Ballads,* III, 71. This ballad, according to Chappell, was published between 1635 and 1642.
[30]"A Very Pleasant New Ditty," *Pepys Ballads,* ed. Rollins, I, 253. Published *c.* 1625.
[31]"The Silver Age, or The World Turned Backward" (1621), *Pepys Ballads,* I, 204.
[32]See, for example, Greene, *Works,* ed. Grosart, IX, 275; Beaumont, *The Knight of*

the Burning Pestle, II, vi; *Roxburghe Ballads,* I, 474; VI, 487.
[33]*Juvenilia,* 2 vols. (Spenser Society, 1871), II, 341.
[34]*Works,* I, 8. "Sering" is an obsolete form of "syringe."
[35]*The Works of John Taylor, reprinted from Folio of* 1630 (Spenser Society, 1868), p. 154.
[36]*Roxburghe Ballads,* VI, 487.
[37]*Ibid.,*
[38]*Satyrical Essayes, Characters, and Others* (London, 1615), p. 273.
[39]*Harleian Miscellany,* 10 vols. (London, 1808-1813), I, 70.
[40]"A Dialogue betweene Master Guesright and poore Neighbour Needy," *Roxburghe Ballads,* I, 232.
[41]II, i.
[42]IV, vii.
[43]*The English Rogue,* 4 vols. (London, 1874), II, 82.
[44]*The Old Book Collector's Miscellany,* ed. Hindley, III, 4.
[45]*Op. cit.,* XI, 275.
[46]I, iii, 14.
[47]IV, ii.
[48]Scene xiii.
[49]*Op. cit.,* II, 82.
[50]Apperson, *English Proverbs and Proverbial Phrases* (New York, 1929), under "Tapster."

THE *SIR THOMAS MOORE* PROBLEM RECONSIDERED

(*Conclusion*)

By Paul Deutschberger

Part II

OF THE two lines of argument marshalled to prove Shakspere's collaboration in *The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore,* we have already disposed of the first. In discussing the aesthetic case one is always confronted by a major methodological difficulty—the deeper one goes, the more enmeshed one becomes in opinion and counter-opinion. But with the second line of argument, the palaeographic, the scholar stands on solid ground in which there is an ultimate, appeal to fact.

We may, at the very outset, reject the graphiological assertions of Richard Simpson, since he assigned the whole play to only three hands. He was incapable of distinguishing between the writings on folios 7b, 8a, 8b, 9a, 11bb, 12a, 12b, 13a, and 14aa; all of which he naively attributed to Shakspere because "the way in which the letters are formed is absolutely the same as the way in which they are formed in the signatureof Shakspere[1]"—an assertion which all now admit to be a patent absurdity.

Although James Spedding, a year later, was able to limit the possible Shakspere contribution to folios 8 and 9, he did this on stylistic grounds, though he claimed that the writing is in a hand "which answers to all we know about Shakespeare's."[2] What Spedding knew about Shaskpere's handwriting amounted to nothing more than that he wrote the Secretary script, as did all his contemporaries.

Spedding and R. W. Chambers dismiss the evidence of the manuscript which (had Shakspere written it) disproves the statement of Heminge and Condell as to Shakspere's fluency and freedom from corrections; the manuscript shows that D did not write with the ease and fluency which Heminge and Condell said was Shakspere's way. In lines 234-258 D is so

balled-up in writing a certain passage that he scratches, emends, adds, and then cancels almost all of it, leaving only a limping and unintelligible line. That cannot be how Shakspere wrote.

It was not until 1916, however, that an attempt was made to put the problem on less hypothetical grounds. In that year, E. M. Thompson, in *Shakspeare's Handwriting,* tried to demonstrate the correspondence between six of Shakspere's signatures[3] and the writing of the Addition. Subsequently, realizing the validity of criticisms and objections brought against his case, Thompson revised it, retracting some of his main points, in *Shakespeare's Hand in Sir Thomas More* (1923), pages 57 to 112.

Notwithstanding the fact that Thompson himself did not claim that his analysis settled the question[4] his followers[5] are not so cautious or moderate in their claims. They refuse to realize that, despite Sir Edward's revision, his essay does not stand up under objective criticism; that it contains many statements which are either ill-founded or unsubstantiable. Four major charges must be made against Thompson's case: first, that it is based upon faulty observation; second, his deductions are invalid; third, his knowledge of Elizabethan calligraphic habits was inadequate; finally, he focussed his attention wholly upon a few so-called graphiological "peculiarities," beliving that if he could show these "peculiarities" to be present both in the Addition and in the Shakspere signatures, it would prove Shakspere the author of the 147 lines in question.

The last mentioned line of argument would be valid if the alleged peculiarities occurred nowhere else but in Shakspere and in D. They are, however, duplicated in hundreds of fifteenth and sixteenth century manuscripts. Furthermore, it can be shown that Thompson was mistaken in some of his observations: that he saw things in the Addition and the signatures which are not there, and that he failed to see, or ignored, peculiarities in the Addition which are not to be found in the signatures.

Not much of Thompson's proof is currently accepted.[6]

Greg[7] and E. K. Chambers are willing to let the "peculiarities" go, preferring to rely on "numerous hardly definable traits of resemblance."[8] But traits that cannot be defined do not exist for the scientific expert, and are admissible only in the realm of the occult.

Inasmuch as the handwriting case is the essential one, we shall reconsider Sir Edward's case and summarize the points made by Dr. Tannenbaum in his various studies of this subject.

1. The use of a flourish ending in a minute curl or dot at the end of terminal letters of words in the Addition Thompson holds characteristic of Shakspere's hand. He thinks there may be such flourishes in the signatures, but he admits that if they are there they are so imperfect that their identity is doubtful. An examination with a magnifying glass or pocket microscope reveals that there is not a single such terminal flourish in the extant Shakspere autographs.

2. Thompson alleges that of the various forms of the letter *k* "Shakspeare makes use in the few signatures of three out of four forms . . . which appear in the Addition." But, the *k* of the Deposition signature nowhere occurs in the Addition; neither does the scrivener's normal *k* of the Addition appear in the signatures. Further, the *k* found on the second page of the will, which Thompson identifies with some of the *k's* in the Addition, is a very common one in Secretary script, as may be seen from Richard Gethinge's *Calligraphotechnia* (1616). This point is, therefore, irrelevant.

3. Thompson goes on: "Various forms that the letter *p* assumes in the Addition are found also in the signatures." The *p's* of the Addition and the *p's* in the signatures are undistinctive variations of a model Secretary "p"; furthermore the *p's* in the Addition do not correspond in details with those of the signatures.[9] Finally, in his discussion of the *pe* combination found in the second word of "Peace, peace, scilens, peace" (line 50), Thompson was completely misled. It is obvious that he did not understand how the letters were written. The *p* he describes as a "short truncated letter, not unlike an ordinary printer's Roman lower-case *p* having a short vertical stem commencing with a small hook

or serif on the left; then a short horizontal bar is drawn to form the base of the head-loop, which is completed by the addition of the necessary curve." Neither the *p*'s in Shakspere's signatures, nor the small *p*'s in the Addition were ever written in that manner.

Only one truncated *p* appears in any of the signatures, in the signature to the Mortgage.[10] That such *p*'s were not unfamiliar to Elizabethan penmen may be gathered from a holograph letter of Sir John Harrington[11], in which at least six such "p's" appear. Besides, there is one variety of *p* which seems characteristic of D[12] and does not occur at all in the signatures.

Again, the *e* of this *pe* combination is a common variant of the formal shape of that letter, and may be found in almost any specimen of the Secretary hand.

4. In connection with the "a" in the word "that" (line 105), Thompson asserts that neither he nor J. P. Gilson had ever found a specimen of an "open *a* . . . formed with a spur at the back, which is no essential part of it, but seems to be a personal mark of the hand," and occurs only in D and in Shakspere.

But examples of the horizontal *a*-spur *are* the rule in George Chapman's hand.[13] In Edward Grimeston's holographs many of these are to be found.[14] C, in *Sir Thomas* Moore, imparts a slightly curved horizontal spur to the second *a* in "hazard," second line from the bottom of folio 11bb. To these may be added examples from the handwriting of Edmund Spenser, John Knox, and Ben Jonson.[15] It is a common feature in Elizabethan documents.

5. Thompson's treatment of the *s*, both capital and small, leaves the critical reader more than merely suspicious of his sincerity and scientific temper.

Early in the essay Thompson declares that the Addition "is written entirely by one hand." Even his followers concede that this is not so. It is admitted now that there are additions and marginal notations by C. Yet a large part of Thompson's

argument is based upon his inclusion of this material among the writing of D—a procedure as preposterous as attempting ing to identify a criminal by attributing to a suspect the features of his neighbor.

Thompson asserted, erroneously, that the (italic) long *s* was the only letter of the Italian alphabet that Shakspere adopted in his signatures. "This *s* occurs in the word 'seriant' (line 17 marg.) and is added in aminute size as a correction to the word 'warre' (line 113)." But there is not a single italic *s* in the whole of the Addition in the hand of D. Where it does appear, in "seriant," it is in C's hand. The *s* in "warres," moreover, is not the italic letter, but is a normal, exceedingly common variety of final Gothic *"s,"* resembling an Arabic 6, such as was generally used as a terminal letter in Shakspere's day. Yet as late as 1939, R. W. Chambers still stuck to this point, obviously because he realized that without it Thompson's case went to pot.[16]

In his revised treatment of the matter, Sir Edward admitted that he was wrong in his observation and comments on the long *s*. He says: "some of my friends, experts in phalæography, who have examined the passage more closely than I have had the opportunity of doing, have given an opinion . . . that the supposed Italian long *s* is nothing more than a pen flourish finishing off the scrawl on one of the deleted strokes" on a word crossed out in line 103. *Who have examined the passage more closely!* Sir Edward's honesty here is, indeed, admirable, but such an admission must reflect upon the value of the paper which stands as the foundation of the entire argument. What are we to think of the value of expert testimony which admits that it identified a mere flourish for one of the unique and distinctive features of Shakspere's handwriting? By his admission, Sir Edward justifies us in thinking that he had not scanned any of the questioned writing closely.

5. Thompson refers to Shakspere's habit of occasionally making long initial upstrokes on some of his letters, *e.g.,* in the *B, m,* and the *W* of "By me William" on the last page of the will. He points out that the one on the *W* leads off with a finely drawn narrow opening which resembles a needle-eye, and which, he claims, is a formation so rare as

to suggest a personal peculiarity by which Shakspere can be distinguished from all other Elizabethan penmen.

It should be needless to say that such initial upstrokes are a feature of many fluent hands; and, therefore, have no identifying value. But, Sir Edward does not rest his case solely on the long upstroke. Finding an instance of a similar needle-eye formation in the upstroke to the *n* of "needs" (line 130 of the Addition), he exclaims enthusiastically, "Is it reasonable to imagine that two different writers should possess the same trick or turn of hand which could thus produce a figure so identical in form in two separate documents?" It certainly is reasonable. Dr. Tannenbaum has found the identical feature in Chapman's holograph inscription to his *Batrachomyomachia*[17]. Curiously enough another example occurs elsewhere in the *Moore* manuscript (!) in the margin of line 31, folio 13b, in the word "Morr" (written by Thomas Dekker).

6. Thompson talks of "minute hyphens" between words, but none such appear in the manuscript. There are occasionally tiny marks made by the pen as it moved from word to word.

7. Thompson claims that the long *s* never post-links with the letter *c*—but just such a linking occurs in line 21 of folio 8a. We mention this only to show what a careless observer Sir Edward really was.

8. He declares that the capital *S* with a sharp chin to the right is exceptionally rare, and of significance because it is common to both Shakspere and D. The fact is that this chin formation is almost universal in Elizabethan documents.[18]

There is, however, one important point in Thompson's case that has not yet been satisfactorily answered, and which now requires our consideration.

Sir Edward, it may be recalled, opens his argument with an attempt to confirm the assertion that Shakspere was the victim of a nervous disorder,[19] writer's cramp, a theory

already enunciated by Dr. R. W. Leftwich.[20] If this had been true, we might perhaps have an explanation for some of the manifold differences between the fluent writing of the Addition and the signatures written at least two decades later.[21] By introducing the theory of writer's cramp to explain why the Addition and the signatures differ Sir Edward admits that the two writings are not alike. But he implies that they would have been alike if Shakspere had not suffered from writer's cramp.

It is obvious that Thompson has immeasurably weakened his case, for, with the introduction of the hypothesis that Shakspere's hand underwent a violent change from about 1613 to 1616, Sir Edward destroys the testimony of five out of the six signatures he accepts as genuine. Eighty-three per cent of his standard for comparison cannot therefore be considered as representative of Shakspere's hand about 1593-1594.

But is it a fact that Shakspere suffered from the spastic condition known as writer's cramp? Sir Edward claims that he did, and relies upon the opinions of Drs. Nisbet and Leftwich. But a reading of Leftwich and Nisbet shows that neither was a neurologist or knew what the nature of writer's cramp is. Furtherfore, neither of them claimed to have studied the penmanship of victims of the disease, and neither had any acquaintance with the Secretary script.

Dr. Charles L. Dana, a New York neurologist of distinction, who had made a special study of writer's cramp, could not find a single evidence of the disease in any of Shakspere's signatures.[22] Dr. Tannenbaum, himself a doctor of medicine and a psychiatrist, has pointed out[23] that writer's cramp does not affect the basic patterns of the victim's letters. It follows that we must regard the Addition and the signatures the work of two different hands, for Sir Edward has very clearly put himself in the position of saying that but for writer's cramp the two writings would have been alike.

In his comments on writer's cramp Thompson refers to the *S* on the third page of the poet's will. Shakspere, says he, "conscious of inability to control his hand when attempt-

ing a curve in reverse action . . . under embarrassing circumstances, as in the present execution of his will," allowed the base curve of the *S* to become entangled with the body of the letter itself, instead of being continued leftward as an inclosing semi-circle." The avoid "embarrassment" in subscribing the signature to the second page of the will, Shakspere "shirks the difficult moment of the curve by leaving a gap in the back of the embracing semi-circle." Sir Edward then proceeds to examine the earlier signatures for further indications of this hypothetical disorder. In the Deposition signature (1612) he notices the break in the base-curve of the *S*, but finds no evidence of disease. The pen, here, he says, had traveled so rapidly "that the ink failed to follow its course throughout and left only a trace in a portion of the base-curve." In the Conveyance and Mortgage-Deed signatures (1613), however, the crucial *S* "reveals sufficient indications of embarrassment to show that the writer was conscious of weakness of hand in forming that letter of alternating curves."

But we have seen that the signatures do not show evidence of writer's cramp. In not considering the construction of the *S* in the Deposition, in not comparing it with the "embarrassed" *S* of the second page of the will, Sir Edward most grievously erred. The *S* in the signature to the second page of the will is identical with the *S* of the Deposition in all essential details.

In short, to explain this omission of the base-curve we need not follow Sir Edward into the realm of psychopathology. Dr. Tannenbaum, who for some years has been studying this particular problem, informs me that in quick and skilful writing most penmen, in attempting to make a leftward curve at the bottom of a letter, tend to relax the pressure upon the pen, often even to lift it entirely from the paper. (Present-day writers often omit the curved stroke connecting the descender and the ascender of the letters *y* and *g*.) We may therefore, says Dr. Tannenbaum, expect any letter with a curve running from right to left at the base to be defective. In the Secretary *per* symbol, in the *p*, and most frequently in the *L*, *J*, and *S*, when written quickly, the base or infralinear loop may appear as a succession of

distinct dots or be entirely wanting. Most frequently, however, the base curve, the loop, or the back of the capital *S* appears as a faint line.

That the missing base-curve of the *S* in Shakspere's signature is not an indication of writer's cramp is obvious from the occurrence of similarly defective *S*'s in Dekker's handwriting.[24] It occurs in the hand of the clerk who copied Shakspere's will. See for instance the first *S* of "Susanna," lines fourteen and sixteen on the second page of that document. On line eight of the same page, the *S* of "Stratford" wants the base curve; while the initial *S* of "Shakspeare" in line 9, third page of the will like that of the Deposition, has a base curve composed of a series of dots. Such *S's* may be found as early as the fourteenth century[25], and there is a beautiful example of it in the manuscript of *Wit and Wisdom,* 5 verso, top, in the word "Severitie."[26]

As to the other letters, we may find many *L*'s in the will showing a defective loop at the back near the bottom; especially in line eleven, page three, in "Leases."[27] In the manuscript of *Wit and Science,* line fifty-nine, page sixty-two, we find a similarly defective *I* in "Ignorance." *Per* symbols[28], *y*'s[29], and even *T*'s[30] with incomplete loops are not difficult to find. That similar gaps are left even in certain flourishes is to be seen in a curious example of an *E* in the handwriting of Nicholas Breton.[31]

Furthermore, the most common feature at the back of the capital *S* in the Secretary script is the fact that the stroke does not form a perfect arc. The tendency, it seems, was to construct the arc out of a series of short angular strokes, a fact of which Thompson, according to Leftwich, seems to have been cognizant.[32] The shaky initial *S* in the signature on the third page of the will is therefore not a pathological formation.

As to the supporting testimony of the signatures to the Conveyance and the Mortgage Deed, that can be dismissed as valueless. The *S* of the Conveyance is obviously a normal specimen; and the signature to the Mortgage is now known to owe its peculiar characteristics to the fact that the parch-

ment surface on which it was written was too greasy to take the ink.[33]

Sir Edward's case is, therefore, in every detail illogical, unscientific, inconsequential and invalid.

But, even though Sir Edward's case has been shown to be worthless, the question may be asked whether a more scientific examination than his might not, after all, show the Addition to be Shakspere's. That this is really impossible follows from Tannenbaum's tabulation of the differences between the writings in question.[35] He points out that the writing of the Addition is smaller and "more compressed, huddled, close-knit." The writing of the signatures shows less freedom than that of the Addition. "The writer of the Addition has a freedom and a swing in his writing, most conspicuous in his capitals, in the reversed loops of his *d*'s and in the long loops of his *y*'s and *h*'s, which is wholly unlike the writing in the unquestioned signatures." The constraint Shakspere shows in the writing of his signatures is shown in his almost constant substitution of angles for curves. Tannenbaum finds, furthermore, that, in general, Shakspere's strokes are heavier than those of the writer of the Addition. Shakspere usually begins and ends his strokes abruptly, whereas D's writing ends with a fine hairline. In his signatures Shakspere never dotted an *i;* D was meticulous in dotting his *i*'s. Whereas Shakspere apparently did not tend to link his letters, *D* frequently wrote whole words without a pen-lift. Significantly, Shakspere's signatures employ several signs indicating abbreviation; in all of the 147 lines, D uses but one type, and that sparingly. Shakspere's *W*'s and those of D are strikingly different in pattern, as are their *l*'s. Since Shakspere seems to have been fond of the ornamental indented *l*, Tannenbaum is quite right in saying that the complete absence of this form of the letter in the three folio pages of the manuscript "is almost sufficient in itself to disprove Shaksperian authorship for them." Shakspere's *a*'s differ in form and variety from those in the Addition. Not a single *m* in the *Moore*-fragment ends in the manner Shakspere's *m*'s do. Shakspere's *h*'s and those of D are dissimilar, the difference in shading, for one thing, indicating, as do the capital *S*'s, that D wrote more rapidly than Shakspere

and used the left nib of the pen more than he. It may be added that Shakspere seldom linked the *h* and the *a* in his signatures. D clearly makes such a ligature in sixty-six instances out of a total of eighty occurrences of this combination in the Addition.

That Shakspere's *B*'s and those of D are wholly unlike in their conception and execution was early pointed out by Mrs. Stopes and Mr. Bayfield[36], sufficient evidence to prove that we are dealing with two different penmen.

We are therefore driven to only one conclusion: Shakspere did not write the Addition in the anonymous play of *Sir Thomas Moore*.

NOTES TO PART II

[1]*Notes and Queries,* July 1fi 1871, p. 3.

[2]*Notes and Queries,* Sept. 21, 1872, p. 228.

[3]The six attached to legal documents: Deposition, May 11, 1612; Conveyance, March 10, 1613; Mortgage-Deed, March 11, 1613; and the three to the will, probably subscribed March 25, 1616.

[4]*Sh's H* and *in STM,* p. 72, "though it does not at once carry vonviction, yet it claims the right of being duly weighed."

[5]A. W. Pollard, *Sh's H. in STM,* p. 13-14; Pollard, *Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates,* 2d ed., 1937, xxiii; R. W. Leftwich, *Shakespeare's Handwriting,* n.d., 20; R. W. Chambers, *Man's Unconquerable Mind* (1939), pp. 239ff.

[6]It was neatly demolished by Tannenbaum, *SP,* 22:133-60.

[7]*TLS,* Nov. 24, Dec. 1, 1927; concedes that two of the four most important points "must be abandoned as doubtful," and that "the other two are somewhat reduced in force."

[8]*William Shakespeare,* 1:508.

[9]Tannenbaum, *SP,* 22:142-143.

[10]For an explanation of the peculiar characteristics of this signature *v.,* Tannenbaum, *Problems in Shakspere's Penmanship,* 1927, pp. 47-65.

[11]Greg, *English Literary Autographs,* II, plate xlv.

[12]*e.g.,* in "ampler" (line 101); "captains" (line 114).

[13]Greg, *English Literary Autographs,* I, plate xii.

[14]Marcham, *The King's Office of the Revels,* 1925, facing page 6.

[15]Tannenbaum, *SP,* 22:139-141.

[16]*MLR,* 26:274. This essay was reprinted in 1939 in *Man's Unconquerable Mind.*

[17]Original in Harvard Library. A facsimile of this is shown in Tannenbaum's *Shakspere and Sir Thomas Moore,* facing p. 16.

[18]See Chapman's writing, Greg, *op. cit.,* plate xii.

[19]Originally propounded by Nisbet, *The Insanity of Genius* (1891), pp. 146-162.

[20]*Shakespeare's Handwriting,* n.d., pp. 7-20.

[21]Thompson accepts 1593-94 as the probable date of the Addition.

[22]"Handwriting in Nervous Diseases," *Essays in Honor of Morton Prince,* 1925. (See *Problems in Sh's Penmanship.*)

[23]*SP,* 22:136-138.

[24]Greg, *English Literary Autographs,* I, plate x, "Somme," "Sett."

[25]Jenkinson, *Later Court Hand in England,* 1927, suppl. plate xxii, sect. ii, line 1, "Seignur."

[26]*Tudor Facsimile Texts* rep., 1907.

[27]Jenkinson, *op. cit.,* plate xix, line 17.

[28]*Ibid.*, plate xxxi, line 15, part II; plate I, line 14.
[29]*Ibid.*, plate xxxiv, lines 9 and 31.
[30]*Ibid.*, plate xix, line 25.
[31]Greg, *English Literary Autographs*, II, plate xxxv, "Emploiment."
[32]Leftwich, *op. cit.*, p. 15.
[33]See note 10.
[34]*V.*, note 12.
[35]*SP*, 22:147-156.
[36]Stopes, *TLS*, May 29, 1919, p. 295; June 19, 1919, p. 537; Bayfield, *TLS*, May 15, 1919, p. 265; May 29, 1919, p. 295; June 5, 1919, p. 312; June 30, 1921, p. 418; also Aug. 18, 1921.

JAQUES' SEVEN AGES

By Josephine W. Bennett

SINCE criticism can be sound only when it is based on and supported by sound scholarship, Professor O. J. Campbell's re-interpretation of the character of Jaques, in his study of *Shakspeare's Satire*,[1] makes timely a reconsideration of the whole question of the source of Jaques' most famous speech. Professor Campbell rejects the common opinion that Jaques voices Shakspere's own dissatifaction with life, and argues that "Jaques is a malcontent traveller anatomized according to the approved psychology of Shakespeare's day;" and that he is treated by the poet, not sympathetically, but satirically.

It has long been known that Jaques' account of the seven ages of man followed a popular pattern of thought; but no close verbal parallel has been established, and it is customary to regard the account as derived from pictorial rather than from verbal sources.[2] Recently the subject was reopened by Professor J. W. Draper, who advanced the argument that the enumeration of *seven* ages was not common, and that a passage in Bartholomaeus Anglicus was Shakspere's direct source.[3] The parallel lies chiefly in the fact that both enumerate *seven* ages, and Professor Allan H. Gilbert very justly pointed out the fallacy of the contention that seven was an unusual number.[4] He cities Censorinus *De die Natali liber,* which describes divisions of man's life into five, seven, four and ten ages. Professor Don Cameron Allen has added a reference to the *Silva de varia leçion* of Pedro Mexia[5] which he quotes in a French translation, but which Shakspere could have seen in the English version of Thomas Fortescue.[6] Mexia says that Pythagoras divided man's life into four parts, according to the seasons of the year; M. Varro names five parts of fifteen years each, Hippocrates names seven, Solon ten, Isidore and some others made only six; Horace like Pythagoras, names four, Aristotle considers only three, and most of the Arabs follow him, but Avicenna has 4, Servius Tullius (in A. Gellius) has only three, but Mexia himself described seven. He says:

> By the common division of Astrologians, as well *Arabies, Caldees, Greekes,* and *Latines*: as also by the particular opinion of *Proclus,*

> *Ptolomie,* and *La Rasellus,* the life of Man is devided in seven Ages, over every one of which ruleth and governeth one of the seven Planetes.

Infancy, he goes on to explain, is governed by the Moon, childhood by Mercury, adolescence by Venus, young manhood by the Sun, maturity (*Aetas virilis*) by Mars, age by Jupiter, and old age by Saturn.

Here we have the basis for what was, unquestionably, a very popular division into *seven* ages.[7] The other widely mentioned account of the seven ages is attributed to Hippocrates.[8] It is largely concerned with fixing the age limits of the various periods, but says that the first age, of seven years, is characterized by the shedding of teeth, the second by puberty, the third by the development of the beard. The fourth extends to the twenty-eighth year, the fifth to the forty-ninth, the sixth to the age of fifty-six, after which old age begins. The authority of this ancient physician is particularly important because the Elizabethans believed firmly in the "climacteric." The year of change from one age to another was a critical one, and the ages were so divided as to bring the change on some multiple of seven. Solon's ten ages were allotted seven years each.[9] Astrology, medicine, and numerology combined to make the seven ages by far the most popular division of human life. although both in literature and in art divisions into any number of ages from three twelve may be found.[10]

But, except for the use of the number seven, Shakspere's account has little in common with either the medical or the astrological convention. He is concerned with appearance and behavior, and his point of view is satiric. It is not surprising, therefore, that critics have assumed that his lines were inspired rather by a picture of the seven ages than by a verbal account.[11]

But there were verbal accounts of the ages of man which have been overlooked, but which are much closer to Shakspere's lines than any so far noticed. Shakspere was not original in combining his description of the ages of man's life with the notion that "all the world's a stage." Marcellus Palingenius Stellatus, in his *Zodiacus Vitae,* begins his

account of the ages of man's life with the statement that life is a pageant; Barnabe Googe, in his translation, adds the gloss, "The world a stage play."[12] This whole book of the *Zodiacus* is devoted to the subject of the folly and futility of human life. It is much in the spirit of Jaques' remarks, and since the *Zodiacus* was widely known and even used as a schoolbook, it is not improbable that in writing Jaques' speech Shakspere intended to recall this passage to his hearers' minds. Palingenius describes the infant as crying, the child was disciplined by masters and parents, the youth as rash, amorous, and ready for brawls. Manhood brings care, labor, and ambition, as well as honor. Old age is marked by grey hair, failing senses, loss of teeth, and dotage.

Some lines, once attributed to Ralegh, seem to be based on this passage in Palingenius. They are headed "De Morte."

> Man's life's a tragedy: his mother's womb,
> From which he enters, is his tiring-room;
> This spacious earth the theatre; and the stage
> That country which he lives in: passions, rage,
> Folly, and vice are actors: the first cry
> The prologue to the ensuing tragedy.
> The former act consisteth of dumb-shows;
> The second, he to more perfection grows;
> I'th'third he is a man, and doth begin
> To nurture vice, and act the deeds of sin:
> I'th' fourth declines; i'th'fifth diseases clog
> And trouble him; then death's his epilogue.[13]

Here we have the moralizing spirit of Jaques and the combination of the idea that "all the world's a stage" with the account of the ages of man.[14] But Palingenius describes only five ages.

The *Onomasticon* of Julius Pollux, a Greek grammarian of the second century A.D., has an account of "the seven ages according to Hippocrates" which includes many striking parallels to Shakspere's lines.[15] The text of the *Onomasticon* was recovered by Filelfo and printed in Greek, with a Latin index, by Aldus in 1502. There were several editions, including one by A. F. Varchiese (1520) dedicated to Thomas Linacre. In 1536 Grynaeus edited it at Basel where, in 1541, the first Latin translation, by R. Gualther, was published. This was the only translation available in the

sixteenth century, and is the one, therefore, which I shall quote.

The *Onomasticon* is a thesaurus, arranged topically rather than alphabetically, and the second book opens with the account of the seven ages of man (pp. 74-78). The paragraphs are numbered, and the first is devoted to Hippocrates' account. The second is "De Hominis Partibus," and the third supplies words for conception, abortion, and parturition. The fourth supplies words descriptive "De Infantibus." These are mostly nouns and noun phrases, but the section ends, "lacents sugens, mamillis uniuens, nuper a fœmina semotus, nuper ablactatus." The construction, as well as the words, are suggestive of Shakspere's infant "Mewling and puking in the nurse's arms." Paragraph V, "De puerulis" has only two lines, but Pollux returns to the second age later, as we shall see. Paragraph VI, "De iuuenibus" which "Adolescentem uocauerunt" is also treated at greater length in a later paragraph. But the fourth age, "De Vivis" corresponds to Shakspere' soldier, "Bearded like a pard." Pollux devotes almost the whole paragraph to the beard and its development in "Iuuenum" and "Uirum."

Paragraph VIII is headed "De Adolescentibus" and should, logically, have formed a part of VI. It begins,

> ADolescentulus, Adulescens. Iuuencus uero licet dicatur, Comicum tamen magis est. Iuuenum uero coetus, neolaila dicitur [the lover]. Deinde Vir est, qui militarem aetatem assecutus est [Shakspere's soldier comes next after his lover], aetatem censui obnoxiam habens, uegetus, feruens, bellicosae aetatis existens, . . .
>
> Jealous in honour, sudden and quick in quarrel,
> Seeking the bubble reputation
> Even in the cannon's mouth . . .

Paragraph IX takes up early middle age, "De Mediae Aetatis: Iuuenibus." It begins, "Concionibus aptam aetatem habens." Shakspere makes him a justice. Pollux supplies words for degrees of grey hair, calls him Senex, and in Greek, Presbyter, and ends, "Nihil est uetustius, pro eo quod est, nihil est nobilius." Shakspere's justice is far more graphic and picturesque,

> In fair round belly with good capon lin'd,
> With eyes severe and beard of formal cut,
> Full of wise saws and modern instances.

Paragraph X, "De Senibus," is uninteresting for our purpose, but XI, "De Vetvstate," has some interesting parallels to Shakspere's last two ages. Pollux quotes Hyperides as saying,

> In senectutis limine, in occasu uitae, ut iam balbutiat lingua, ut uox obscura et intricata existat, ut uox erret, . . .
>
> and his big manly voice,
> Turning again toward childish treble, pipes
> And whistles in his sound.
>
> ut senectus imbecillem reddiderit ["second childishness"], ut pedes tremant & labentur, ut sint obliqui, inconstantes, . . . & his similia.

The old man may be described as

> Senior Saturno, edentulus [sans teeth], Senex capularis, decipiens, clamosus, desipiens, insulsus [sans taste], attritus, silicernium, inuersus propter aeternem, immutatus ceruos, aut cornices aetate superans aut Nymphis coaetaneus, & similia [sans everything].

Pollux next devotes a paragraph to women, but paragraph XIII returns to the subject "De Formatis ab aetatibus uerbis," and runs through some further descriptions of each age. Here we find the schoolboy:

> Ephebis exire, instituere, tum etiam puerascere, educatio. Et Puerilis disciplina, apud Platonem inuenitur, . . .

Youth is characterized by rashness or hastiness.

> Lysias Iuueniliter audaces nominauit, & audaces Iuuenes. Viriliter autem agere . . . unde Viriliter, et fortiter, ut Plato dixit, unde etiam Coetus uirilis, secundum Isaeum . . .

But when youth passes old age comes on, and we have another collection of words to describe its infirmities. Only one phrase is especially suggestive of Shakspere. Pollux includes what Gualther translates as "extendi membra." A later translator renders the phrase "membra emarcida"[16] which might have suggested "his shrunk shank."

Though Shakspere was a keen observer of life at first hand, it does not seem probable that independent observation would have produced so many parallels of phraseology. He follows Pollux rather than either the astrological or the medical tradition in the general characteristic of each age, since Hippocrates puts the development of the beard in the third age, Shakspere and Pollux put it in the fourth. Mexia assigns the fifth age to Mars. Shakspere and Pollux put soldiering in the fourth; Shakspere's fifth age is nearer Mexia's sixth. Hippocrates gives no descriptive details about the sixth and seventh ages. Mexia gives some, but

those of his sixth age do not correspond to Shakspere's, and Pollux has many and better parallels for the seventh age.[17]

Altogether there are so many more verbal parallels between Pollux and Shakspere than between any other author and the poet that, unless further evidence can be discovered, we must assume that Shakspere's was drawing, either directly or indirectly, on the *Onomasticon*. It is tempting to conjecture that the country youth, coming up to town and finding himself in competition with university men in the business of playwriting, made an effort to improve his education and his vocabulary and so became acquainted with this famous thesaurus.

Unfortunately, we cannot be sure that he did not make the acquaintance of Pollux either in the schoolroom at Stratford, or indirectly through some lost or unidentified English rhetoric or wordbook. What we can be reasonably sure of is that he was following a verbal rather than, or in addition to, a pictorial tradition, and that he was putting into Jaques' mouth, as Professor Campbell believes, not an expression of personal disillusion, but a set of rhetorical commonplaces such as a conventional malcontent of no great intellectual stature might utter.

Hunter College, New York City.

[1]Oxford Press, 1943, p. 51.

[2]See the collections in Boswell's Malone ed. (1821), VI, 519-21; J. W. Jones, "Observations on the Origin of the Division of Man's Life Into Stages," *Archaeologia,* XXXV (1853), 167-89; J. G. Waller, "Christian Iconography and Legendary Art: The Wheel of Human Life, or the Seven Ages," *Gentleman's Magazine,* XXXIX (1853), 494-502; John Martin (ed.), *The Seven Ages of Shakespeare* (London, 1840), an elaborate but unimportant study; Henry Green, *Shakespeare and the Emblem Writers* (1870), 405-10, which follows Jones and adds little; and the editions of *As You Like It* in the New Variorum Shakespeare, ed. H. H. Furness, VIII (1890), 122-24; The Arden Shakespeare, ed. J. W. Holme (1914); and G. L. Kittredge's edition (Boston, n.d.), p. xvii.

[3]"Jaques' 'Seven Ages' and Bartholomaeus Anglicus," *MLN, LIV* (1939), 273-76.

[4]"Jacques' 'Seven Ages' and Censorinus," *MLN,* LV (1940), 103-51.

[5]"Jacques' 'Seven Ages and Pedro Mexia," *MLN,* LVI (1941), 601-3.

[6]This is an abridged translation of Mexia, but it gives the passage in question in full. It appeared in 1571 under the title, *The Foreste or Collection of Histories,* and is from the French of Claude Gruget (1552) rather than from Mexia's Spanish (1543). See Bk. I, ch. 17, pp. 45-49.

[7]Sir Walter Ralegh follows Mexia in his account of the seven ages in his *History of the World,* I, 2, sec. 5; see Works (Oxford, 1829), II, 60.

[8]It does not appear in the extant works of Hippocrates, and is known only through the report of Philo Judaeus, in his *Liber de mundi opificio;* see *Philo,* ed. F. H. Colson and G. T. Whitaker (Loeb Classics, 1929), I, 83-87. Philo also describes Solon's ten ages.

[9]Macrobius describes an elaborate division and sub-division of man's life into periods of seven years, months, and days; see *In Somnium Scipionis,* Bk. I, ch. 6.

[10]Professor S. C. Chew, in a lecture at the Pierpont Morgan Library, has recently presented a very interesting collection of illustrations of pictorial representations of the ages showing every number from three to twelve.

[11]It seems not to have been recorded in this connection that there was a tapestry of the "Seven Ages of Man" hanging in the royal palace at Greenwich about the time of Queen Mary, and no doubt still there in Shakspere's day; see E. Hasted, *Kent* (1778), I, 60, from MS. Harl. 1419, fol. 37.

[12]Edition of 1588, pp. 99-100, under "Virgo."

[13]Ralegh's *Works,* VIII, 704-5. The lines may post-date Shakspere's, but they are in spirit and substance a summary of Palingenius.

[14]I am indebted to Miss Rosamond Tuve for calling my attention to this passage.

[15]The accounts of the seven ages in both Censorinus and Pollux were first mentioned in this connection by J. W. Jones, *op. cit.,* but not described or discussed.

[16]Ed. Amsterdam, 1706, pp. 153-63.

[17]*Notes and Queries,* III, xii, 123, notes that Florio's Montaigne has the phrases "sans tongues, sans eyes, and sans ears" in the "Apologie for Raymond Seybound." It also notes (I, xii, 7) that the psuedo-Platonic *Axiochus* describes the successive miseries of human life. But the division is into five ages; see the facsimile reprint of the translation attributed to Spenser by F. M. Padelford (Johns Hopkins Press, 1934), pp. 46-48.

SHAKSPERE'S HEROIC SHREW

By Raymond A. Houk

(*Conclusion*)

II

Shakspere's heroine is neither to be listed in medical journals as a case of deranged physical functions nor in theological libraries as an example of a woman who was possessed of a devil; Katherine is rather to be placed in the galaxy of Shakspere's women among those who come but short of perfection.

During the course of *The Shrew* it becomes apparent that a bride should be young and beautiful, and not without an ample dowry; fair and chaste, with all the virtues of modesty and sobriety. She should be gentle, temperate, and patient, conformable in all things to her duty. She should be kind and loving, obedient, in turn, to her parents and to her husband, and not niggard in giving thanks.

She should look as clear as morning roses newly washed with dew (II.i.173-174); she should be virtuous and fair (lines 43, 92), though brown in hue as hazelnuts; straight and slender as the hazel twig; princely in gait as Dian in a grove (lines 254-263). She should not be proud-minded (line 132), but mild and pleasant, courteous and, possibly, slow in speech (lines 247-248), knowing when to be silent and when to speak with soft low tongue and lowly courtesy (Ind.i.114). The ideal wife should have a cheerful countenance, sweet as springtime flowers, never frowning or sour, with no sullen biting of the lip (II.i.229, 231, 245, 248-250) or threatening unkind brow (V.ii.136). She should, however, not be without wit and eloquence (II.i.177). Affable and merry, she should share in gamesome mood the humors of her husband (lines 247, 253). Of all titles she should avoid, the worst, such a one as 'Katherine the curst' (I.ii. 129-130; II.i.187).

With this latter paragraph (largely derived from Petruchio's not wholly mocking description of Katherine in the wooing scene), with the rhyme of curst and worst, may be

compared a similar negative-and-positive description of the ideal wife in Robert Tofte's translation of Lodovico Ariosto's Satire on Marriage—a satire which tells how to choose and how to rule a wife:

> Pure of complexion let her be and good,
> And in her cheekes faire circled crimson blood.
> Hie colours argue choler and distaste,
> And such hot blouds are seldome made to waste.
> Let her be milde and wittie, but not curst,
> Nor foolish, for of all breeds thats the worst.
> None so deformed are, or ugly foule,
> As fooles which more are gazd at then the Owle:
> .....
> Let her be pleasing, full of curtesie,
> Lowly of minde, prides deadly enemie:
> Pleasant of speech, seldome sad or never,
> And let her countnance chearefull be for ever,
> A viniger tart looke or clowdy brow,
> Furroud with wrinckles I doe not allow.
> And so to pout or lowre through sullennesse,
> Is a strong signe of dogged peevishnesse. (p. 57)[39]

Shakspere's ideal of womanhood obviously was his in common with those of other men. He was, however, probably too much of a realist, and a humorist, to believe implicitly in his own idealizations, for, before the play is over, he permits even the model Bianca to exhibit some of the qualities of a shrew.

The difference between Katherine and other women of better reputation, accordingly, may be regarded as merly one of degree. In *The Defence of Good Women* Sir Thomas Elyot declares that Aristotle says, "that a woman is a worke of nature unperfecte. And more over, that her propertie is to delyte in rebukyng, and to be alway complayning, and never contented."[40] Althought such a characterization may be unfair to women in general, it would seem to fit Shakspere's shrew well enough. In *A Shrew*, II.i.5, Valeria refers to "Kate" as one "whom nought can please."

There are many indications in *The Shrew* that Katherine may have been accustomed to have her lugubrious moments (cf. II.i.286; IV.i.146, 152). After a stormy and futile scene Katherine bids her father,

> Talk not to me! I will go sit and weep
> Till I can find occasion of revenge. (II.i.35-36)

Petruchio presently prepares himself to meet and woo a Katherine who may "rail" and "frown" or who may be "mute and will not speak a word" (lines 170-175).

When, shamed by the non-appearance of the bridegroom on the day appointed for her marriage, Katherine, after a brave speech (III.ii.8-20, 26), exits "weeping," she would seem to have just cause, as noted above; yet Baptista's words, "I cannot blame thee now to weep" (line 27), would seem to imply that she may have been wont to weep without rhyme or reason.

Later, when tamed, Katherine addresses the "froward wives" in words once applicable to herself:

> Fie, fie! unknit that threatning unkind brow,
> And dart not scornful glances from those eyes
> To wound thy lord, thy king, thy governor!
> It blots thy beauty as frosts do bite the meads,
> Confounds thy fame as whirlwinds shake fair buds,
> And in no sense is meet or amiable.
> A woman mov'd is like a fountain troubled,
> Muddy, ill-seeming, thick, bereft of beauty;
> And while it is so, none so dry or thirsty
> Will deign to sip or touch one drop of it. (V.ii.136-145)

These lines may be thought, in part, indicative of choler, but the "fountain troubled" and the "frosts" which bite the meads would seem more suggestive of melancholy.[41] Although Katherine is often moved to anger, she is also frequently moved to tears.

Aristotle, as quoted by Elyot, may well have had a shrew in mind when he stated that a woman's "propertie is to delyte in rebukyng, and to be always complayning, and never contented." With such a conception Shakspere's heroine, as a typical shrew, is in entire accord.

Probably no one in sixteenth-century England needed to be told what a curst shrew was, but many a man may have wished he knew how to tame his. That Shakspere himself believed in the efficacy of Petruchio's method is to be doubted; he concludes *The Shrew* with a remark by Lucentio, " 'Tis a wonder, by your leave, she will be tam'd so."

1. Lucentio, however, would probably have been sur-

prised had he been told that Katherine had been "reduced to marital compatibility" by a "physical therapy." Thus has Mr. Draper reaffirmed his thesis of "Kate the Curst" by the statements, here quoted in full, that "Kate is reduced to marital compatibility by damp and cold and starvation," and that Shakspere in *The Shrew* "cures the disease of choler in a few scenes by the recognized physical therapy, which is forced upon the patient."[42]

(1) Although Petruchio makes some use of "starvation," it is more than doubtful whether "damp and cold" play, or are supposed to play, a part in the taming of the shrew.[43] The word 'damp' does not occur in *The Shrew*.

It is true, the time is obviously winter, the weather cold, and fire required (IV.i.4, 17, 21, 41; V.ii.102); but, except for some choice clowning by Grumio the fool, no use is made in *The Shrew* of the idea of cold.

To Curtis' question, "Is she so hot a shrew as she's reported?" (IV.i.22), Grumio replies proverbially,

> She was, good Curtis, before this frost; but thou know'st winter tames man, woman, and beast; for it hath tam'd my old master, and my new mistress, and myself, fellow Curtis. (lines 23-26)

The latter, it may be observed (lines 27-28), seems to regard Grumio's statement as having been made for no purpose other than to call him a beast.[44]

Grumio is accustomed to speak with humorous exaggeration. He calls himself "a piece of ice" and declares that his "master and mistress are almost frozen to "death" (lines 14, 40).[45] Yet when Petruchio and Katherine actually appear there is no reference made either to cold or to any need of heat.

Such an effect of frost upon "man, woman, and beast" was more humorously than literally alleged. Moreover, winter's taming of all living creatures subject to its cold would be something other than the taming of a shrew. Neither Grumio, Petruchio, nor Katherine has actually been tamed; Grumio explicitly warns Curtis lest he feel their mistress' hand (line 32). But Grumio's words are as unnecessary as irrelevant, for, as Curtis finally permits himself to declare, "There's fire ready" (line 41; cf. lines 55, 97-98, 117-118).[46]

There is no evidence in *The Shrew* that Katherine suffers cold at any other time than, possibly, during the horseback ride on the afternoon of her wedding day. Accordingly, when Hortensio on Thursday asks her,[47] "Mistress, what cheer?" and she replies, "Faith, as cold as can be" (IV.iii.37), neither of them, apparently, is referring to the temperature of the air or of her body.[48] Petruchio exhorts her, "Pluck up thy spirits; look cheerfully upon me" (line 38). Fasting from Sunday morning (or Saturday evening) to the following Thursday, together with loss of sleep, would seem to be sufficient to account for Katherine's depressed spirits. Grumio's statement on her wedding day that winter "hath tam'd my old master, and my new mistress, and myself" (IV.i.24-25), is a fool's jest which should fool no one.

There is, accordingly, no evidence in *The Shrew* to support Mr. Draper's assertion that "the cold and mud of the journey counteract her hot, dry humor, and start the cure" of Katherine the curst.[49]

(2) Mr. Draper's other assertion that, in the country, "the severe regimen of cold and hunger and watching tempers her choleric spirit until she learns to 'entreat',"[50] is not, however, so obviously in error. Deleted of the word 'cold' and made to read, "the severe regimen of hunger and watching brings Katherine to a realization of her folly in having refused to give thanks for services rendered her," it would seem to be a fairly correct description of the course of events.

Somewhat beside the point, Mr. Draper cites Galen in support of the notion that "much eting is also dangerful to this [choleric] humor," and asserts that Petruchio "sees to it that she shall have little food."[51]

Enforced fasting or starvation does play an important part in the taming of the shrew, but the "starvation" involves more than a mere reduction in the amount of food allowed Katherine; it would seem to be, while it lasts, total. The first food which is given to her after her marriage on Sunday is that in the scene of IV.iii.36-52 (which must be dated Thursday). The question becomes, accordingly, not whether a reduced diet would be beneficial to one supposed to have

a choleric humor, but whether a four days' fast would have been prescribed by Shakspere's medical contemporaries as a cure for choler.

Sir Thomas Elyot is on record as having declared that, "to a choleryke person, it is right dangerous, to use long abstinence."[52] Andrew Boorde likewise declared, "Colorycke men should not be longe fastynge."[53] These two, at least, would hardly have thought that the fasting ordeal, to which Petruchio subjects Katherine, would cure choleric humor.

Although, after her bootless attempt to avoid being beholding to Petruchio for her meat (IV.iii.1-35), Katherine is permitted to eat on Thursday, her taming has not yet been affected; she merely meets one of Petruchio's conditions, that of giving thanks (lines 41-47). That she has not fully subdued herself to her husband, is vividly brought out in the subsequent episodes of the cap and the gown, and in the dispute concerning the time of day.

It would seem, accordingly, that Petruchio does not tame his wife by means of any "physical therapy."

2. The taming of the shrew is a process to which many things contribute. Properly understood in the traditional sense, it is something other than a rectification of bodily disorders; it involves a change in Katherine's way of thinking.

An early clew as to Petruchio's method is provided by the jesting Grumio. Says he, "O' my word, an she knew him as well as I do, she would think scolding would do little good upon him" (I.ii.108-110). Scolding would seem to be a device employed by Katherine to gain her own way;[54] there are obviously others in her bag of tricks, but Petruchio is to be moved by none of them; he presently informs Baptista:

> I am as peremptory as she proud-minded;
> And where two raging fires meet together,
> They do consume the thing that feeds their fury.
> Though little fire grows great with little wind,
> Yet extreme gusts will blow out fire and all.
> So I to her, and so she yields to me,
> For I am rough and woo not like a babe. (II.i.132-138)[55]

Despite these physical images (which have original reference to his wooing), Petruchio does not, even after his marriage, lay a violent hand upon Katherine. He and she seem to recognize the fact that no gentleman would strike a lady (II.i.220-223). Directing his oaths and blows at his hapless servants, Petruchio anticipates Katherine in every imminent outburst of violence and abusive words, so that the latter presently finds herself, in a role new to her, interceding in behalf of the servants and urging her husband to patience.

Grumio, having already spoken of the "foul ways" (IV.i.2), says, not without possible exaggeration, to Curtis:

> Tell thou the tale But hadst thou not cross'd me, thou shouldst have heard how her horse fell, and she under her horse; thou shouldst have heard in how miry a place, how she was bemoil'd, how he left her with the horse upon her, how he beat me because her horse stumbled, how she waded through the dirt to pluck him off me; how he swore, how she pray'd that never pray'd before; (lines 74-81)

"Patience, I pray you. 'Twas a fault unwilling" (line 159), urges Katherine when Petruchio strikes another servant. I pray you, husband, be not so disquiet" (line 171), she implores him after he may have thrown the meat at the servants.

Similar to Petruchio's rôle of a "grumbling groom" (III.ii.155; IV.i.191-192) is the simulated wrath of "the Father" who could "act any Part, as well as any Comedian," in Eulalia's tale to Xantippe of "a Gentleman of a noble Family" who married a young Lady, a Virgin of seventeen Years of Age," in Desiderius Erasmus' colloquy "The Uneasy Wife" (translated in 1557 as *A mery dialogue declaringe the propertyes of shrowde shrewes and honest wyves*).[56] As Petruchio is neither to be satisfied with a railing scold nor with a sullen peevish wife, so Erasmus' hero, who wanted "an agreeable Companion," not "one that was always a crying, and fretting herself," thought to form his wife's "Manners to his own Humour."[57] As Erasmus' hero, whom Eulalia calls "the best natur'd Man in the World" (and whom modern historians would identify with Sir Thomas More),[58] is reluctant to follow the suggestion of his "Father-in-Law" that he "cudgel" his "disobedient" wife "into a due

Submission," so Petruchio also prefers the use of "Art or Authority" to persuade Katherine to submit to his will.

Katherine, as the "young lady" of Eulalia's tale (whose original may have been More's first wife, Jane Colt), who formerly "neither knew" her husband nor herself, is to become "another Sort of Person," henceforth "mindful of her Duty."[59]

Eulalia's young lady is an example of a petulant bride who had to be taught obedience to the rule of her husband. Xantippe, the uneasy wife of Erasmus' merry dialogue, illustrates the more violent aspects of Katherine's conduct.[60]

In *The Wife Lapped in Morels Skin* the unnamed husband beats Jone with birch rods until she swoons, and then binds her, naked and bloody, in a salted raw horsehide until she has a change of heart.[61]

Ariosto, in his Satire on Marriage, offers advice to a lord. After he has told the "thrice noble Hanibal," according to Robert Tofte's version, "how a wife to chuse," Ariosto gives him further directions:

> But now since I have taught thee how to get,
> Thy best of choice, and thee on horse-backe set.
> Ile learne thee how to ride her: wild or tame,
> To curb her when, and when to raine the same: (p. 62)

Tofte has interpolated the phrase, "wild or tame." The Italian runs:

> Poi ch'io t'ho posto assai ben a cavallo
> Ti voglio pur mostrar come lo guidi,
> Come spinger lo dei, come fermallo. (379a)[62]

In *The Shrew*, II.i.278-280, Petruchio declares to Katherine:

> For I am he am born to tame you, Kate,
> And bring you from a wild Kate to a Kate
> Conformable as other household Kates.

Ariosto continues with the figure of a horse:

> Meglio con la man dolce si raffena,
> Che con forza il cavallo: e meglio i cani
> Le lusinghe fan tuoi, che la catena. (379a)

This Tofte renders as:

> A gentle hand, A Colt doth sooner tame
> Then chaines or fetters which do make him lame. (p. 62)[63]

On the superiority of a gentle hand over chains or fetters Shakspere is in agreement with Erasmus and Ariosto as against the author of *The Wife Lapped in Morels Skin.*

Instead of a horse or a colt, however, Shakspere uses the figure of training a falcon:

> My falcon now is sharp, and passing empty,
> And till she stoop she must not be full-gorg'd,
> For then she never looks upon her lure.
> Another way I have to man my haggard,
> To make her come, and know her keeper's call:
> That is, to watch her, as we watch these kites
> That bate and beat and will not be obedient. (IV.i.193-199)

Obedience seems to have been the chief thing a sixteenth-century husband demanded of a wife.

Katherine, although not yet minded to show obedience to her husband, seems to have shown some recognition of the virtue of patience; but Petruchio remains dissatisfied with her failure to "give thanks" before meat (IV.i.161-163); he continues the taming process with the requirement that she shall voice thanks for services rendered her (IV.iii. 39-43); then he requires that she shall cease to contradict him, no matter how wrong he obviously is; finally he requires that she shall enter with full abandon into his mood. Nothing less than a complete revolution in her way of thinking is Petruchio's demand.

Although Katherine apparently has made some sort of submission to Petruchio before they take to the road on Thursday afternoon to journey to Padua, she does not fully see the light until, as it were on the road to Damascus, she has a sudden burst of understanding, and decides to play Petruchio's game:

> Forward, I pray, since we have come so far,
> And be it moon, or sun, or what you please.
> And if you please to call it a rush candle,
> Henceforth I vow it shall be so for me. (IV.v.12-15)

The measures which Petruchio had previously taken, such as depriving her of meat and sleep, and of a new cap and gown, may have shown her the folly of refusing to fall in with his humor. Petruchio had given no sufficient reason for dragging her home before the wedding dinner (III.ii.

186-194); he gave a reason by no means valid for depriving her of supper on Sunday evening; what reasons he may have given her for keeping her fasting from Sunday to Thursday are not fully stated; his reasons for rejecting the new cap and gown were nonsensical (IV.iii.59-170); his statement on Thursday afternoon that it was "some seven o'clock" in the morning (IV.iii.189-190) was so palpably wrong that, had Katherine then had an active sense of humor, she would hardly have bothered to correct him; however, when, somewhat later in the day, Petruchio calls the sun a moon (IV.v.2), she understands, though a little belatedly, that he is but being humorous. Possibly Katherine's metamorphosis (so called in *The Taming of a Shrew,* V.i.88) consists in gaining a saving sense of humor, as well as in yielding the mastery to her husband. Her words to Vincentio would seem to have something of a humorous cast (IV.v.37-41,45-49).

Although tamed, her spirit remains unbroken. Katherine has subdued her mind, heart, and reason to her husband (V.ii.170-171), yet much to Petruchio's delight, she retains her full vigor, as of old, to be employed with obvious relish against the headstrong women (lines 20-35, 136-179).

It may, accordingly, be concluded that the heroine of *The Taming of the Shrew* is not to be described as the victim of a choleric humor, nor is the taming process to which she is subjected to be called a cure for choler; she is neither to be thought of as sexually thwarted nor as possessed of a devil. Katherine, once a wailing woman and a common scold, is so changed in the latter scenes of the play that Petruchio foresees for himself "peace" and "love, and quiet life," and, "to be short, what not that's sweet and happy" (V.ii.107-110). An understanding wife, responsive to her husband's will and ready to "do him ease" (line 179), Katherine is superior to Bianca, and inferior to none of Shakspere's heroines.

Washington, D. C.

[39]This quotation from *Ariosto's Satyres* (London, 1608), with its mention of "choler" and "hot blouds," would possibly have more significance for the problem of Shakspere's use of medical terms in *The Shrew* if it could be demonstrated that Tofte had made his free and annotated translation in time for its use in the original shrew play. Tofte's manuscript had been in other hands for some time before its publication, as he indicates by his statement that it had been printed without his "consent or knowledge, in another man's name" (*The Blazon of Jealousie,* London, 1615, p. 6, 28, 63). It is definitely known that Tofte was making translations from Ariosto in

1592, for the first of his *Two Tales, Translated out of Ariosto* (London, 1597), is dated "Siena 28. di Lulio 1592." Tofte was in Italy "between March, 1591, and June, 1594." (Franklin B. Williams, Jr., "Robert Tofte," *RES,* XIII [1937], 287). Had Tofte forwarded his manuscript of *Ariosto's Satyres* to England in time for its use in the original shrew play and in *The Shrew,* the fact would serve to explain how the manuscript had come into other hands and was published without his knowledge.

Besides the quotation given above, there are also other parallels between *Ariosto's Satyres* and *The Shrew* and *A Shrew,* both individually and in common. The relationship indicated would seem to be an influence from *Ariosto's Satyres* first upon the common source of *A Shrew* and *The Shrew* and then upon *The Shrew* alone, much as Ariosto's *I Suppositi* was first used for the earlier form of the play and then used by Shakspere when he rewrote it as *The Shrew.*

[40]E. J. Howard (Oxford, Ohio, 1940), p. 26. It may be of some significance for Katherine's telling the headstrong women "What duty they do owe their lords and husbands" (V.ii.130-179), that Elyot's Zenobia sets forth in Aristotelian terms, derived from her "studye in moral philosophy," the "duety" of women to their husbands (*ibid.,* pp. 55-57). There are other indications that *The Defence of Good Women* may have influenced *The Shrew* in its original form.

[41]See note 55 below.

[42]"Benedick and Beatrice," *JEGP,* XLI (1942), 140.

[43]Mr. Draper's declaration (*JNMD, op. cit.,* p. 760) that Shakspere in *The Shrew* "adds to his source [by which he means *A Shrew*] a description of the journey after the wedding with its detail of the cold inclement season, for this was doubtless intended to play its part in the curing of Kate's choler," is misleading. In *A Shrew* also the time is supposed to be winter; fire is provided in Ferando's chamber (III.i.35-36), and mention is made of "the winter rage" (III.v.59).

[44]A hint for such name calling was probably found in Ariosto (*Supposes,* III.i. 19-21).

[45]Taking Grumio literally, Mr. Draper reads his own ideas into the text of *The Shrew,* when he declares that "Petruchio took care to expose his wife to mud and mire and cold," etc. (*op cit.,* p. 760), The word 'mud' does not occur in *The Shrew.*

[46]Mr. Draper, who refers to "a cheerless house in which apparently the servants have not yet made the fire" (*op. cit.,* p. 760), seems to have overlooked Curtis' statement.

[47]See note 15 above.

[48]This is in opposition to Mr. Draper, who also erroneously dates the scene of IV.iii.1-58 on the day after the wedding (*op. cit.,* p. 760).

[49]*Ibid.,* p. 761.

[50]*Ibid.,* pp. 761-762.

[51]*Ibid.,* p. 760.

[52]*The Castel of Helth* (London, 1541), p. 71 *verso,* fascimile, New York, 1936. Elyot, citing "Hipocrates" and "the opynion of best lerned men," as well as his "own peynful experience," supports his declaration with divers reasons.

[53]*A compendyous Regyment or a dyetary of Helth* (London, 1542), F. J. Furnivall, *EETS,* Ex. Ser. No. 10, p. 288, London, 1870.

[54]Cf. Draper, *op. cit., p.* 758.

[55]Mr. Draper asserts: "Petruchio more auspiciously compares his humor and hers to 'two raging fires' that will the more quickly burn each other out" (*op. cit.,* p. 759). This would seem to be an improper use of the figure of the "two raging fires" (II.i.133) to build up a case for a choleric humor.

[56]First edition in 1523. Cf. *The Colloquies of Erasmus,* tr. by Nicholas Bailey (ed. 1878, London), I, 249-251. *Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami Opera omnia* (Lugduni Batavorum, 1703-1706), I, 702-707. The unique copy of the 1557 translation of "The Uneasy Wife" (London) is in the British Museum. The tale of the "Gentleman" and the "young Lady" was omitted from the translation of the "Dialogue betweene a good Woman and a Shrew" in William Burton's *Seven Dialogues both pithie and profitable* (London, 1606).

[57]Bailey, I, 250.

[58]Bailey, I, 251. Cf. P. S. Allen, "More and Netherhall," *LTSS* (Dec. 26, 1918), p. 654; Preserved Smith, *A Key to the Colloquies of Erasmus* (Cambridge, 1927), p. 15. More's second wife, the widow Alice Middleton, is also said to have been something of a shrew.

[59]Bailey, I, 251.

[60]Other parallels with *The Shrew* would seem to support a suggestion that Shakspere may have used "The Uneasy Wife" and others of Erasmus' colloquies. Cf. "The Integrity of Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew*," *JEGP*, XXXIV (1940), 225.

[61]See note 28 above, and pp. 82-88.

[62]See note 39 above. This is "Satira Quinta" in *Opere di M. Lodovico Ariosto* (Venezia, 1730), II, 377-379. Numerous editions of *Le Satire* appeared after Ariosto's death in 1533.

[63]It may be only a coincidence that Sir Thomas More's first wife, whom he is said to have taught obedience, was a Colt.

POLONIUS'S ADVICE TO LAERTES

By N. B. Allen

THE question of how we should interpret Polonius's advice to Laertes in *Hamlet,* I, 3, has been the source of much difference of opinion. The difficulty arises from the fact that the advice is wise and well phrased, while the speaker of it, Polonius, is elsewhere a foolish old man.[1]

As Professor Schücking has pointed out[2], attempts to harmonize the speech with Polonius's character take two forms. Some critics try to raise the character of Polonius to the level of the speech, others to lower the speech to the level of Polonius. The first group supposes that Polonius has not always been a fool—if he had been, they say, Claudius would not respect him as he does.[3] Therefore, when he can depend upon his stored-up knowledge, they declare, he sounds like a wise man; otherwise he reveals that he is a simpleton.[4] The second group argues that the speech is not really wise at all, that it is a trite collection of so-called wisdom which only a vulgarian could admire. By parading such trivialities, they insist, Polonius increases our contempt for him.[5]

The weakness of the first argument—that this is stored-up wisdom—is that Polonius does not elsewhere reveal this ability to memorize and repeat. It is true that he often boasts of the lessons he has learned from life—as in his warning to Ophelia earlier in the same scene and in his explanation to the Queen of the reason for Hamlet's madness (II, 2), but in these cases his wisdom is clownish and lamely expressed, not well integrated and epigrammatic as in the passage in question.

The second argument—that the speech is contemptible—is an obvious rationalization. Nearly all modern readers do admire Polonius's advice, and its similarity to passages in Lyly's *Euphues* and Lodge's *A Margarite of America,*[6] both of which were then popular, indicates that the attitude of the Elizabethans was the same.

But when it is concluded that the passage is in fact out of character, the problem still remains: Why did Shakspere

put it into the play? Schücking has given no answer to this question.

It seems possible that Shakspere was here using a passage not originally intended for *Hamlet*. The following arguments can be advanced in support of this possibility:

1. Polonius makes no specific reference to Laertes or his journey to France except in the two lines:

> And they in France of the best rank and station
> Are of a most select and generous chief in that.

And these lines are easily separable from the rest. Indeed, the typesetter of Q_1 seems to have realized that they should be so separated, for he omitted from them the quotation marks by which he indicated the gnomic quality of the rest of the speech.[7]

2. When read in connection with the preceding and following lines, the passage shows evidence of having been inserted. Polonius tells Laertes to hasten and then delays him with this long advice. Of course, it may be argued that Shakspere was trying by this means to make Polonius ridiculous,[8] but if he had been would he not have made the passage ridiculous as well? Did Shakspere expect the audience to have the perspicacity to laugh at Polonius for giving advice at the same time that they revered the advice he gave? In this connection it should be noted that if the passage is deleted from the text, the continuity of the speeches which remain is excellent.

3. As has been often shown, Shakspere has elsewhere made insertions in his plays, insertions which in two cases are clearly indicated by the mislining of the blank verse. This mislining apparently resulted when the passages were added in the margins of the manuscripts. The passages are "The lunatic, the lover, and the poet" speech of Theseus in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, V, 1,[9] and Mercutio's "Queen Mab" speech in *Romeo and Juliet*, I, 4.[10] The second of these passages is no more in keeping with Mercutio's character than is the advice to Laertes with that of Polonius. During most of the play Mercutio burlesques romantic

ideas in bawdy terms. Here he speaks with fragile daintiness. It is true that both Mercutio's and Polonius's speeches may be made fairly convincing when spoken by an actor on the stage—Shakspere would not have put them into the plays if this were not possible—but the inconsistencies are there, for all that.

Critics who believe in the complete unity of Shakspere's text should remember before they show too much zeal in its defense that to make an insertion in a play was not extraordinary in Shakspere's time. According to a large body of critical opinion, Ben Jonson made insertions in Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy,* and Middleton did the same thing in Shakspere's *Macbeth;* and in neither case is the added material altogether in keeping with the rest. That Shakspere was acquainted with the practice is shown by his representing Hamlet as making an insertion "of some dozen or sixteen lines" in *The Murder of Gonzago,* as well as by the textual evidence of the two passages in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Romeo and Juliet* cited above.

But this merely proves that the passage *may* have been inserted. The strongest evidence is, after all, the lack of harmony between the speech and the character. The character of Polonius is comparable to a cathedral part of which is built in an architectural style different from the rest—like Chartres or St. John the Divine. The natural supposition of those who see one of these cathedrals is that the inharmonious part was built earlier or later than the rest. And yet neither in the character nor in the cathedral is beauty destroyed.[11]

[1]L. L. Schücking, in *Character Problems in Shakespeare's Plays* (New York, 1922), pp. 102-103, has shown that Polonius is, during nearly all the play, little better than what Hamlet calls him, a "tedious old fool."

[2]*Ibid.,* pp. 105-109.

[3]Schücking cites Richard Loening (*Die Hamlet-Tragödie Shakspeare* [Stuttgart, 1893] pp. 298-319) as an example of this type of critic. Loening insists that there are no real contradictions in Shakspere's handling of Polonius. He says (p. 299): "Der Dichter hat . . . hier einen völlig einheitlichen und harmonischen Charakter geshaffen."

[4]In *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre,* Goethe makes the actor who is to take the part of Polonius say (Book V, Chapter 6): "Ich will reden wie ein Buch wenn ich mich vorbereitet habe, und wie ein Thor, wenn ich bei guter Laune bin."

[5]Joseph Quincey Adams, in his commentary to his edition of *Hamlet,* (Cambridge, 1929) p. 206, says of Polonius's advice to Laertes: "His fondness for trite wisdom gets the better of him. . . . It is, indeed, amusing how the intellectually middle class like tags of wordly wisdom or platitudinous sentiment."

[6]William Lowes Rushton, in *Shakespeare's Euphuism* (London, 1871), pp. 44-47, tries to show that Shakspere's passage was imitated from *Euphues:* and Frederick Brie, in the *Shakespeare Jahrbuch* (XLII, 1906), pp. 209-211, claims that Lodge's work was the source.

[7]In this lack of reference to the situation, Polonius's speech is different from many of Shakspere's gnomic passages. Prospero, for instance, in his speech about the transitory nature of life (*The Tempest,* IV, 1, 148-158) refers twice to the pageant of spirits which aroused him to philosophize.

[8]Loening (*Ibid.*) and J. Q. Adams (*Ibid.*) make this claim.

[9]The blank verse of this passage was mislined in Q_1. See the note by J. D. Wilson to the Cambridge edition (Cambridge, 1924), and my note in *The Shakespeare Association Bulletin* (April, 1938), pp. 121-122.

[10]This passage was printed as prose in Q_2 of *Romeo and Juliet.* See J. Dover Wilson and A. W. Pollard, "The 'Stolne and Surreptitious' Shakesperian Texts. 'Romeo and Juliet, 1597,'" *Times Literary Supplement,* (August 15, 1919), p. 434.

[11]A like suggestion is made in relation to Hamlet's third soliloquy in an article by me in *The Shakespeare Association Bulletin* (October, 1938). See pp. 201-207.

Editorial Comment

WAS SHAKSPERE A BOTCHER?

By S. A. T.

Dr. Allen's essay on Polonius's advice to the departing Laertes, published in this issue of the BULLETIN, is deserving of especial attention, not only because of its logic and persuasiveness but also because of its implications. If Dr. Allen is right in thinking that Polonius's advice is sound, logical and sensible, and therefore not fitting such a foolish person as Polonius is portrayed to be, then we must assume either that Shakspere, being an incompetent artist, bungled his delineation of the loquacious old councillor, making him an inconsistent personality, or, being an unconscionable artist, foisted into the play a speech which he happened to have in his notebook and which he was loath to leave unused.

Undoubtedly writers do insert lines and even paragraphs and whole sections and pages of material into their compositions, be these poems, plays or novels, but they do not insert matter that is irrelevant or not in harmony, or even in actual disharmony, with what precedes or follows. Furthermore, when an artist, be he poet, dramatist or novelist, makes such an insertion, he knows how to link it to the rest of the work in such a manner as to avoid detection. He not only knows how to do so but he does it. The fact that Polonius's speech (*Hamlet,* I, iii, 57-80, in Furness's edition) can be omitted without spoiling the continuity of the speeches proves nothing. Many speeches — and even whole scenes — can be deleted from Shakspere's (and others' plays) without leaving a noticeable gap or giving an impression of patchiness. Dr. Allen's statement that it "has been often shown" that "Shakspere has elsewhere made insertions in his plays" is an erroneous over-statement; this has not been *shown* to have been the case even in the two instances he cites (Theseus's and Mercutio's speeches); it has only been *asserted* or *claimed,* not shown. Mislining of speeches, the basis for the assertion, may result from other causes than marginal additions; besides, the Polonius speech is not mislined.

Even if we assume that the speech is too wise for Polonius, it does not follow that the speech was not originally intended for him. Shakspere is frequently inconsistent in his character delineations; note, for example King Lear, Macbeth and his Lady, Cloten, and even Hamlet,—hence the interminable discussions regarding them. What persons in real life are not sometimes inconsistent? Sensible persons often say and do foolish things, and foolish persons sometimes speak and act sensibly. Polonius speaks wisely, very wisely, when he says "We are oft to blame in this, that with devotion's visage and pious action we do sugar o'er the devil himself." Wise old man! Why should a person in a play always be consistent? After all, Shakspere was only telling a story, not writing character sketches; if the story at some point required or suggested a certain action or speech, he had no hesitation in introducing it, even though it might seem out of character or improbable. (Note, for example, the utterly preposterous scene in *Othello* [Act IV, i, 104-179] in which the Moor is eavesdropping on the conversation between Iago and Cassio.) He is downright contemptible when, for the sake of a smutty joke, he makes Cleopatra ask a cringing messenger for "what good turn" Antony and Octavius have become such good friends. A son leaving home suggests a bit of paternal advice, as we see in the Countess's farewell to

her son in *All's Well* (written about the same time when *Hamlet* was writhen); Shakspere's mind was not wholly free from the law of the Association of Ideas.

But, after all, the important question is whether Polonius's speech is out of character. Is it a collection of wise and well-phrased maxims put into the mouth of a foolish person? We propose to show that it is not, that there is really little in the old man's advice worthy of serious consideration.

'Give thy thoughts no tongue,' he says; in other words, never say what you think. A fine world this would be if we all followed that advice, or if all of us spoke only what we pretended to think. 'Give no unproportioned thought his act' would make good sense if the word 'unproportioned' meant 'impulsive'; if it means 'improper,' as Schmidt defines it, it is childish and appropriate only if the father knows his son to be irresponsible or foolish. Kittredge's gloss, 'unsymmetrical, out of harmony with reason and good conduct, does not make it any wiser. 'Be thou familiar but by no means vulgar' is trite even for old Polonius. This is also true of what he says about new friends. It requires no extraordinary wisdom to caution a young man not to rush into a quarrel and to make his opponent 'be 'ware of him' (surely not 'beware of him'), *i.e.,* to give a good account of himself, if he is drawn into a quarrel. "Give everyman thine ear, but few thy voice' repeats 'Give thy thoughts no tongue.' (Kittredge's definition of 'voice' as 'suffrage, recommendation, approval' is hardly wise.) Nor is one entitled to a place in the catalogue of the particularly wise for instructing his son not to spend too much on his clothes.

'Neither a borrower nor a lender be; for loan oft loses both itself and friend' is as selfish as it is foolish. Shakspere himself, we know, was a lender. Every person sometimes has to borrow; most business men depend upon the ability to borrow in their business ventures. Would any decent person refuse to lend money to a friend in need because a loan oft loses itself and friend? Just what would Polonius expect Laertes to do if he were asked for a loan by one of those friends whose 'adoption' he had tried and whom he had grappled to his soul 'with hoops of steel'? And certainly the generalization that 'borrowing dulls the edge of husbandry' is, to say the least, not universally applicable.

The high esteem in which Polonius's speech is generally held depends, in all likelihood, on the concluding lines: 'to thine own self be true, . . . thou canst not then be false to any man.' Kittredge says (in his edition of *Hamlet,* p. 155) that this precept 'raises the whole speech to a high ethical standard' and calls it (p. 157) 'one great general truth which includes and ennobles' all the rest. But it is noteworthy that not a single commentator has paraphrased or interpreted the words. Good reason why. The words have a fine sound but their meaning is obscure. When is a person true to himself? Is it when he is actuated by his selfish interests? If so, it expresses a vicious and damnable doctrine. Is the German true to himself when he seeks to destroy everything that does not contribute to the enslavement of all but himself? Or is a person true to himself when he acts in accordance with his training and his habits, even though these have made him a profiteer, a racketeer, a gangster? Did Polonius anticipate Spencer's doctrine that the greatest egoism is the greatest altruism? We doubt that either Polonius or Shakspere thought that.

Summing it all up, Polonius's percepts of wordly wisdom are the half-foolish utterances of a 'practical,' garrulous, selfish old politician, perfectly in harmony with his character.

Some Members of our Association will undoubtedly be interested in a recent book by Mr. Alden Brooks, one of our most active members, which bears the following suggestive title:

WILL SHAKSPERE AND THE DYER'S HAND

The book is intended to prove that William Shakespeare's plays were written by Sir Edward Dyer. It is published by Charles Scribner's Sons of New York, consists of 724 pages, well printed and bound, at $5 per copy. This is Mr. Brook's second book on the subject of the authorship of the Shakespeare canon.

28/3 London Uni 3 Patt